

**Remarks**

The foregoing proposed amendment presents amended claims 1-12 and newly added claims 13-17. As a result of this Amendment, claims 1-17 remain in the application. Allowance of claims 1-17 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 USC Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant believes many of the cited typographic errors are due to the electronic filing. Claims are presented and amended here as they are believed to have been filed. Other noted informalities such as "the said" and "such as" have also been corrected to provide clarity. Finally, with respect to claims 1, 11, and 12, the examiner should note that the rings are concentric metallic rings positioned around the longitudinal axis of the helix antenna and that the rings run along either a total length or a partially length of the helix antenna should be sufficiently clear as recited. Thus, Applicant respectfully believes that claims 1-12 as amended overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,788,272 to McCarthy ("McCarthy"). In FIG. 3 of McCarthy, the "ring" 60 is really a ground plane (as noted in col. 3, lines 12 and 38). This ground plane 60 is clearly connected to the helical element. Note, there is no FIG. 6 in McCarthy. In FIG. 5 of McCarthy, the "ring" 80 is a "shorting ring" as described in column 4, line 9. Again, the ring 80 is clearly connected to the helical elements 72, 74, 76, and 78 and specifically shorts them together. In contrast, the rings in accordance with the embodiments herein are parasitically coupled to the helical element(s) of the helix antenna. McCarthy fails to teach, suggest, mention or contemplate such parasitically coupled rings that surround the helical element(s) of a helix antenna. The rings in McCarthy are merely a ground plane or a shorting ring which is quite different from a parasitically coupled ring recited in claim 1. Although dependent claim 10 includes at least one ring that can connect to a helical element, at least one ring is parasitically coupled as recited in independent claim 1.

The Examiner also rejected claims 2, 3, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCarthy. Once again, McCarthy fails to suggest, mention or contemplate the use of concentric parasitic rings as claimed in the amended independent claims (1, 11, and 12).


Furthermore, McCarthy fails to suggest, mention or contemplate the use of separate substrates where one substrate carries the helical elements and another substrate carries the parasitic rings. McCarthy only makes mention of "radome effects" that are "easily dealt with by equal element length alterations." This clearly has nothing to do with parasitic rings, separate substrates or the placement of rings on a radome as recited in claims 6 and 7.

Thus, for all the reasons provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-13 are novel and non-obvious and overcome the rejection based McCarthy under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a).

An indication of allowability is respectfully requested. Should any minor points remain prior to issuance of a Notice of Allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

September 15, 2005  
Date

  
Pablo Meles  
Registration No. 33,739  
Akerman Senterfitt  
222 Lakeview Avenue, Suite 400  
P.O. Box 3188  
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188  
Tel: 954-759-8959